



February 11, 2010

Mr. Chris Tolles CEO Topix L.L.C. 1001 Elwell Court Palo Alto, CA 94303

Dear Mr. Tolles:

We write to notify you of our significant concerns with the Topix.com "Forums and Polls" pages and Topix's \$19.99 fee for "priority review" of inappropriate posts that violate your website's terms of service. We believe that representing that consumers must pay a fee to remove inappropriate posts, combined with the design of that feedback system, and the lack of adequate disclosure about the system, pose serious consumer protection concerns.

Our initial investigation reveals that the forums and polls section of Topix is used to post derogatory information, in blatant violation of Topix's terms of service. Indeed, the forums appear to operate without moderators and contain obscene, vulgar, and abusive posts, often concerning minors. In many communities, these abusive posts make up a significant percentage of the "traffic" in the "Forums and Polls" pages.

Consumers concerned about false, obscene or derogatory information that had been posted and who had flagged a post as inappropriate, were outraged that they were required to pay \$19.99 to have the post receive "priority review." These consumers clicked on the "report abuse" link located in proximity to the objectionable post, which links to a drop down box providing two options - - simply flagging the post or paying \$19.99 for priority review. Several reported that the "flagging" option was ineffective. Our initial testing has confirmed that report.

The three methods Topix employs for reporting inappropriate posts appear designed to encourage users seeking to have abusive posts removed, to select the costly "priority review" option. Topix also fails to disclose in proximity to the abusive post that an alternate, free option is available to leave feedback on an inappropriate post. Although Topix claims to monitor its site for inappropriate content, it appears that the feedback system Topix has put in place is actually designed to maximize Topix' revenue from the "priority review" feedback option, rather than providing other effective tools to properly monitor its site for and remove posts that violate its terms of service.

We ask that you contact us to respond to these significant concerns critical to protecting consumers.

Jack Conway Attorney General

State of Kentuky

Richard Blumenthal

Attorney General State of Connecticut